

Amdt. dated January 3, 2005
Reply to Office action of October 1, 2004

Serial No. 09/770,894
Docket No. BLD920000045US1
Firm No. 0036.0080

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner found that claims 7-9, 17-19, and 27-29 would be allowed if rewritten in independent form including the requirements of the base claims. Applicants submit that these claims are in condition for allowance in their current form because the base claims from which they depend are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed below.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 6, 10-14, 16, 20-24, 26, and 30 as obvious (35 U.S.C. §103) over Konishi (U.S. App. No. 20040012807) and Suzuki (U.S. Patent No. 6,549,947). Applicants traverse.

Claims 1, 11, and 21 concern interfacing with a print driver and require: receiving data transmitted from the printer driver; receiving an acknowledgment request from the printer driver, wherein the printer driver does not send further data to print until receiving an acknowledgment reply indicating that the transmitted data passed an initial check; transmitting an acknowledgment reply to the printer driver in response to the acknowledgment request before completing the initial check of the sent data to cause the printer driver to send further data; resynchronizing data processing operations in response to detecting an error in the received data; and rasterizing and outputting the data.

The Examiner cited the "reply issuance request from the printer driver" in FIG. 1 and 14 and pg. 5, pars. 89-94 of Konishi as teaching the claim requirement of receiving an acknowledgment request from the printer driver, wherein the printer driver does not send further data to print until receiving an acknowledgment reply indicating that the transmitted data passed an initial check. (Office Action, pg. 2) Applicants traverse.

The cited pg. 5 discusses that the printer checks whether data or an instruction received from the host computer is received and if data other than print data is received, the printer determines whether the received information is reply information, and if so the printer extracts processing information from the reply information and returns the job processing information to the job processing information detection section 4 in the host computer, which then sends the received data to the job processing state monitor section 5.

Amdt. dated January 3, 2005
Reply to Office action of October 1, 2004

Serial No. 09/770,894
Docket No. BLD920000045US1
Firm No. 0036.0080

Nowhere does this cited pg. 5 of Konishi anywhere teach or suggest receiving an acknowledgment request from a printer driver, wherein the printer driver does not send further data to print until receiving an acknowledgment reply indicating that the transmitted data passed an initial check. Instead, the cited Konishi discusses how the printer may send job processing information to the job processing information detection section 4, which then sends the data to the job processing state monitor section 5. Nowhere does the cited Konishi anywhere teach or suggest the claim requirement that the print driver does not send further data to print until receiving the acknowledgment reply. The Examiner has not cited any part of Konishi that teaches that the processing state monitor 5 receiving the data from the printer causes further data to not be sent until an acknowledgment reply is passed.

The Examiner cited pg. 2, pars. 14-17 of Konishi as teaching the claim requirement of transmitting an acknowledgment reply to the printer driver in response to the acknowledgment request before completing the initial check of the sent data to cause the printer driver to send further data. (Office Action, pg. 2)

The cited pg. 2 discusses the reply information. The reply information is provided by the reply information issuance section, which is in the print driver. (FIG. 1, block 7). The print data processing means (which appears to be the printer 11) interprets the print data, detects the reply information and returns the reply information to a predetermined destination, where the reply information is issued at a predetermined position of the print job data, such as the job start, job end or top or last of each print page. (Konishi, pg. 1, paras. 10-1) In the print driver, the reply information detection means sends detected reply information to the job processing state monitor means in the printer driver 5.

Although the cited Konishi discusses the printer returning reply information included in the print data being processed, nowhere does the cited Konishi anywhere teach or suggests that the printer returns the reply information before completing the initial check of the sent data to cause the printer driver to send further data. There is no suggestion in the cited Konishi that the

Amdt. dated January 3, 2005
Reply to Office action of October 1, 2004

Serial No. 09/770,894
Docket No. BLD920000045US1
Firm No. 0036.0080

reply information is sent before completing the initial check of the send data and to cause the printer driver to send further data.

Moreover, the cited Konishi teaches away from the claim requirement that the acknowledgment reply is sent before completing the initial check of the sent data because Konishi states that "the print data processing means [the printer] returns the reply information after completion of processing of the print data.." (Konishi, pgs. 1-2, para. 13) Konishi further states that the "return timing of the reply information can be specified on the timing specification information after completion of the print data." (Konishi, pg. 2, para. 15). Thus, Konishi teaches away from sending an acknowledgment reply as claimed, because Konishi mentions that the printer returns the reply information after processing the print data, not before completing the initial check of the sent data as claimed.

The Examiner cited Suzuki for the last two limitations of the claims. However, Applicants submit that the independent claims 1, 11, and 21 are patentable over the cited combination because the cited Konishi does not teach or suggest the claim requirements for which Konishi was cited.

Claims 2-4, 6, 10, 12-14, 16, 20, 22-24, 26, and 30 are patentable over the cited art because they depend from claims 1, 11, and 21, which are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above. Moreover, the following below discussed dependent claims provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Claims 2, 12, and 22 depend from claims 1, 11, and 21 and further require that the received data comprises a first received data set, further comprising receiving a second data set from the printer driver after transmitting the acknowledgment reply and before completing the rasterization of the first data set. The Examiner cited input jobs in FIGs. 4-5 of Suzuki as teaching the additional requirements of these claims (Office Action, pg. 3) Applicants traverse.

The cited FIG. 4 shows the operation of the print driver at the time of the print operation and FIG. 5 shows the operation of the print monitor at the time of the print operation. (Suzuki, col. 9, lines 25-30) According to FIG. 4, the print driver receives a report about RAM capacity,

Amdt. dated January 3, 2005
Reply to Office action of October 1, 2004

Serial No. 09/770,894
Docket No. BLD920000045US1
Firm No. 0036.0080

determines the communication mode, and receives data from a graphic device interface, prepare print data, and transfer the print data to the spooler. According to FIG. 5, the print monitor, inputs print data by way of the spooler, manages a sequence of input jobs, and establishes communication with a printer. Nowhere in the cited FIGs. 4 and 5 is there any teaching or suggestion that the print driver or print monitor receive a second data set from the print driver after transmitting the acknowledgment reply and before completing the rasterization of the first data set. This specific sequence of when the second data set is not taught in the cited operations of FIGs. 4 and 5 of Suzuki.

Accordingly, claims 2, 12, and 22 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Claims 10, 20, and 31 depend from claims 1, 11, and 21 and further require transmitting the acknowledgment reply to the printer driver in response to the acknowledgment request before completing the initial check of the sent data comprises an asynchronous processing mode, and wherein resynchronizing data processing operations in response to detecting the error comprises beginning a synchronous processing mode wherein the acknowledgment reply is sent to the printer driver in response to the acknowledgment request after completing the initial check of the resent data.

The Examiner cited col. 10, lines 1-45 of Suzuki as teaching the claim requirement that resynchronizing data processing operations in response to detecting the error comprises beginning a synchronous processing mode wherein the acknowledgment reply is sent to the printer driver in response to the acknowledgment request after completing the initial check of the resent data. (Office Action, pg. 4) Applicants traverse.

The cited col. 10 discusses how print data is placed in a queue where a sequence of input print jobs are managed. Sequential orders are utilized at re-transmission of the page resource or band data in the event of an error. (Suzuki, col. 9, line 64 to col. 10, line 11) Although the cited Suzuki discusses sequential commands, nowhere does the cited Suzuki teach or suggest that resynchronizing comprises beginning a synchronous processing mode when an asynchronous

Amdt. dated January 3, 2005
Reply to Office action of October 1, 2004

Serial No. 09/770,894
Docket No. BLD920000045US1
Firm No. 0036.0080

mode was used before detection of the error. In other words, nowhere does the cited Suzuki anywhere teach or suggest switching from asynchronous mode to synchronous mode printer processing in response to detecting an error.

The cited col. 10 further discusses how a print monitor communicates with a printer to determine whether to send pages. Nowhere does the cited col. 10 anywhere teach or suggest the claim requirement of switching from asynchronous mode to synchronous mode printer processing in response to detecting an error, so that in the synchronous mode the acknowledgment reply is sent in response to the acknowledgment request after completing the initial check of the resent data.

Accordingly, claims 10, 20, and 31 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art.

The Examiner rejected claims 5, 15, and 25 as obvious (35 U.S.C. §103) over Suzuki and Konishi and further in view of Parker (U.S. Patent No. 6,441,919). Applicants submit that these claims are patentable over the cited art because they depend from claims 1, 11, and 21, which are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above.

Conclusion

For all the above reasons, Applicant submits that the pending claims 1-30 are patentable over the art of record. Applicants have not added any claims. Nonetheless, should any additional fees be required, please charge Deposit Account No. 50-0563.

\\

\\

\\

\\

\\

\\

\\

\\

Amtd. dated January 3, 2005
Reply to Office action of October 1, 2004

Serial No. 09/770,894
Docket No. BLD920000045US1
Firm No. 0036.0080

The attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact him at (310) 553-7977 if the Examiner believes such contact would advance the prosecution of the case.

Dated: January 3, 2005

By: _____

David W. Victor
Registration No. 39,867

Please direct all correspondences to:

David Victor
Konrad Raynes & Victor, LLP
315 South Beverly Drive, Ste. 210
Beverly Hills, CA 90212
Tel: 310-553-7977
Fax: 310-556-7984